

Remarks/Arguments

In an Office Action dated June 13, 2006, claims 5 and 54 were rejected. Claims 55-57 were objected to. The remaining pending claims were allowed. Applicants traverse the rejections of claims 5 and 54.

Claim 5

Claim 5 was rejected over Ogawa in view of Holden. Applicants traverse this rejection.

Claim 5 requires the first virtual channel to be chosen based on the identity of the source of the Fibre Channel data frame. The Office Action acknowledges that Ogawa does not explicitly disclose this requirement but then goes on to discuss the source routing method. The Office Action then discusses Holden and cites col. 2, ll. 17-27, reproduced below.

20 The routing table circuit means of the present invention is
by way of example a self-contained circuit that is operative
to receive standard 53-byte ATM packets or cells from a
source on up to 2048 "Virtual Channels" defined by a header
of an ATM packet. A standard-ATM cell has 48 bytes of data
and a 5-byte header which defines the source, destination,
and priority of the cell. The routing table circuit means is
operative to implement a routing table that uses the address
25 field in the header of the ATM packet to look up the intended
address in its RAM. The routing table then adds a six-byte
routing tag to the cell and causes the resultant cell to be
output to the switch fabric. The routing tag determines the
exact path the cell is to take through the switch fabric and
30 also specifies other characteristics about the cell, such as its
priority and its type, i.e., whether or not it is a multicast cell
being transmitted to more than one output. The routing table

Referencing lines 23 to 26, the routing table circuit of Holden uses the "address field in the header . . . to look up the intended address in its RAM." (emphasis added) Holden thus uses the destination address as the key into the routing table. This is repeated at col. 13, ll. 11-14 reproduced below.

As described above, the routing table circuit **30** of the ¹⁰
present invention receives a cell from a source, looks up the
intended address in its RAM, adds the appropriate routing
tag to the cell, and then puts the cell out onto the switch
fabric via the switching elements. The routing table circuit

Therefore Holden does not provide the teaching missing from Ogawa of using the identity of the source of the data frame to choose the virtual channel but actually uses the destination of the data frame to choose the virtual channel. Holden teaches away from using the source as required by the claim.

Therefore claim 5 is submitted as being allowable.

Claim 54

Claim 54 was rejected over Ogawa in view of Nishimura. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 54 requires the first small Fibre Channel switch use a first basis to identify the virtual channel and the second small Fibre Channel switch use a second, different basis to identify the virtual channel. The Office Action referenced Ogawa and node 1b using cell 3a and node 1c using cell 3b to identify the virtual channel. Applicants respectfully submit that nodes 1b and 1c both use the same basis, namely analysis of the cell at the top place of the cell stream. See col. 6, lines 43 to col. 7, line 3. Node 1b detects the top cell 3a and uses the destination address to do VPI/VCI transformation. Node 1c detects the top cell 3a but discards it and then uses the new top cell 3b to determine the destination address for VPI/VCI transformation. Thus Applicants submit that both nodes 1b and 1c in Ogawa use the same basis, namely the destination address in the top cell present at the VPI/VCI transformation stage.

The Office Action addressed this argument by indicating that the presence of the different destination addresses can be considered different bases. In part this position is stated as being based on “basis” in the claim not being clearly stated. Applicants respectfully traverse this position.

Applicants understand this to essentially be indicating that the destination address values are different between cells 3a and 3b and the fact that the values are different makes the determinations to be on different bases. Applicants respectfully submit that this is an erroneous characterization. It is clear that if different values are present in the item that is used to determine the virtual channel, then different virtual channels may result. That does not mean that different bases are being used to determine the virtual channel as indicated in the Office Action, just that different values may result from the determination. Applicants again submit that the same basis is being used in Ogawa in both nodes 1b and 1c, namely the destination address in the top cell present at the VPI/VCi transformation stage. Just because the destination address values may be different between the two cells does not mean that each node is not using the destination address in the top cell to determine the virtual channel.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 54 is allowable over Ogawa and Nishimura when the actual operations of Ogawa are fully considered.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 3, 5, 7-11, 13, 18 and 23-57 are allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

9/5/2006
Date
Filed Electronically

/Keith Lutsch/
Keith Lutsch
Reg. No. 31,851
Email: WCPatent@CounselIP.com
Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,
Rutherford & Bruculeri, L.L.P.
20333 State Highway 249, Suite 600
Houston, TX 77070
Voice: 832/446-2405